

22



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,981	03/03/2000	Julie A. Bearcroft	P01952US0	5566

26271 7590 10/28/2002

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP
1301 MCKINNEY
SUITE 5100
HOUSTON, TX 77010-3095

EXAMINER

PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3738

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/517,981

Applicant(s)

BEARCROFT ET AL.

Examiner

Brian E Pellegrino

Art Unit

3738

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian E Pellegrino.

(3) Melissa Sistrunk 5) Jila Bakker.

(2) Paul Prebilic.

(4) Thomas Paul 6) Ed Margerrison.

Date of Interview: 24 October 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: sample particles of the claimed species were presented along with a "substantially" similar model of a prior art particle.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ersek and Sheppard references.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives proposed amending the claim to recite that the particle had only six extremities, and that the particle had bilateral symmetry which appeared to define over the Ersek reference. The Sheppard reference was reviewed and it was determined that particles are formed in an array and it was suggested to define how the structure works together in an array to permit tissue ingrowth through the matrix or array.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Brian Pellegrino
Examiner's signature, if required